

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

Room 222
DOCKETS

30 JUN 1993

IN REPLY REFER TO:
7330-7/1700A3

Mr. C.W. Reed II
5408 Woodson Road
Raytown, Missouri 64133

RECEIVED

JUL 26 1993

Dear Mr. Reed:

This is in response to your letter to Congresssman Bond dated ~~OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY~~, regarding the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235, 57 FR 54034 (1992). You are specifically concerned about the potential impact of our final rules on radio remote controlled airplane hobbyists.

Model airplane users have shared spectrum on a secondary basis with industrial users for over 25 years. The low power industrial user and the radio control model airplane hobbyists effectively share spectrum through geographic separation. We are enclosing the Report and Order in GEN Docket 82-181, 47 FR 51875 (1982), which provided the current 50 channels for radio controlled model airplanes. These rules, adopted at the behest of the model airplane community, provide no protection from interference from licensed sources. We further note that the radio environment is inherently hazardous and that even primary allocations suffer from problems. For example, model aircraft users receive interference from other model aircraft users and from certain TV channels. Thus, model aircraft must be, and in fact are, capable of co-existing with some interference. As to your concern about the proposed frequency tolerance, this is a carryover from current rules and will be appropriately adjusted in any final rules.

The Commission is seeking to work with all parties on this matter. To this end, FCC staff has met with the two largest industry groups representing model airplane users, the Academy of Model Aeronautics and the Sport Flyers Association, to discuss their concerns and methods of expanding capacity for private land mobile radio users without affecting radio control users. Following the comment and reply comment periods, we will endeavour to adopt reasonable final rules as soon as possible.

We want to thank you for your interest. Your letter will be included in the formal record of this proceeding.

Sincerely,

15/

Joseph A. Levin
Chief, Policy and Planning Branch
Private Radio Bureau

Enclosure

Copy to: Honorable Christopher S. Bond

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

0+1
5

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND

MISSOURI

COMMITTEES

APPROPRIATIONS
BANKING, HOUSING AND
URBAN AFFAIRS
SMALL BUSINESS
BUDGET

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2503

June 8, 1993

Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to me by one of my constituents concerning the FCC's position on Proposed Rule 92-235. Because this is an issue over which your department has jurisdiction, I thought you would be interested to know about it.

I would appreciate a response to the enclosed letter at your earliest convenience. Please feel free to respond directly to my constituent who has been notified of our contact and will be awaiting your reply. Also, please forward a copy of your response to my office.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Christopher S. Bond

CSB/sg
Enclosure

PRB
92-235

2490

4/27/93

The Honorable Christopher S. Bond
293 Russell Bldg
Washington DC 20510

Dear Senator Bond,

Thank you for your letter regarding the FCC's position on Proposed Rule 92-235. I received the FCC reply that was given to other Senators and I must assume they sent you one too. Unfortunately their reply is full of errors and does not state the true facts as it applies to radio control

SPECIAL FREQUENCY ALERT UPDATE

Copied from AMA National Newsletter, by Bob Underwood

On Wednesday, March 10, 1993, just prior to the filling of the

~~the following subject letter was received from the~~

FCC's Question and Answer Response

At the present time many of you are receiving responses from the Senators and Representatives to whom you have written, concerning NPRM 92-235. Most new members who have received such letters have been provided the same basic information. This is because the FCC has provided a so-called "boiler plate" response to Congressional inquiries. The letter is often in two parts; the first being a cover letter signed by Ralph Haller and a second in a question/answer format whose author is not identified. The answers are consistent with the information provided verbally by Doron Fertig, the Senior Economist responsible for drafting the 419 page document (NPRM 92-235) that sets the plan for the new frequency assignments.

The responses provided in the question/answer document indicate, that in the commission's opinion, the assigned

This statement is very interesting in two respects. First, the underlined word "are" indicates that the usage currently exists. We are very much aware of the concern which developed relating to a petition by Robinson Engineering in Texas, to share the model frequencies. That plan was rejected by the FCC. Robinson Engineering was granted a three year waiver to convert equipment they had already placed on model frequencies and move it to the assigned licensed frequencies. That waiver ends this month.

The second importance to the statement revolves around the fact that it designates a specific use for the proposed new frequencies. That statement is not supported by any such listing in 92-235. They are listed in the document as "general category" frequencies.

4 "Model airplane enthusiasts seek clear areas and